arXiv:1402.2903v1 [cs.DM] 12 Feb 2014

Computing Unique Maximum Matchings in $O(m)$ time for König-Egerváry Graphs and Unicyclic Graphs

Vadim E. Levit[1] and Eugen Mandrescu[2]

[1] Department of Computer Science and Mathematics
Ariel University, ISRAEL
levitv@ariel.ac.il
[2] Department of Computer Science
Holon Institute of Technology, ISRAEL
eugen_m@hit.ac.il

Abstract. Let $\alpha(G)$ denote the maximum size of an independent set of vertices and $\mu(G)$ be the cardinality of a maximum matching in a graph G. A matching saturating all the vertices is a *perfect matching*. If $\alpha(G) + \mu(G) = |V(G)|$, then G is called a König-Egerváry graph. A graph is *unicyclic* if it has a unique cycle.

It is known that a maximum matching can be found in $O(m \bullet \sqrt{n})$ time for a graph with n vertices and m edges. Bartha [1] conjectured that a unique perfect matching, if it exists, can be found in $O(m)$ time.

In this paper we validate this conjecture for König-Egerváry graphs and unicylic graphs. We propose a variation of Karp-Sipser leaf-removal algorithm [11], which ends with an empty graph if and only if the original graph is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique perfect matching (obtained as an output as well).

We also show that a unicyclic non-bipartite graph G may have at most one perfect matching, and this is the case where G is a König-Egerváry graph.

Keywords: unique perfect matching, König-Egerváry graph, unicyclic graph, Karp-Sipser leaf-removal algorithm, core.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper G is a simple (i.e., finite, undirected, loopless and without multiple edges) graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$. If $X \subseteq V$, then $G[X]$ is the subgraph of G induced by X. If $A, B \subseteq V(G)$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$, then (A, B) stands for the set

$$\{e = ab : a \in A, b \in B, e \in E(G)\}.$$

The *neighborhood* $N(v)$ of a vertex $v \in V(G)$ is the set $\{u : u \in V \text{ and } vu \in E\}$. For $A \subseteq V(G)$, we denote

$$N_G(A) = \{v \in V(G) - A : N(v) \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$$

and $N_G[A] = A \cup N(A)$, or for short, $N(A)$ and $N[A]$. If $N(v) = \{u\}$, then v is a *leaf* and uv is a *pendant edge* of G. Let leaf(G) stand for the set of all leaves in G. A graph is *unicyclic* if it has a unique cycle. Unicyclic graphs keep enjoying plenty of interest, as one can see, for instance, in [3, 23, 26, 27, 31, 32].

An *independent* set in G is a set of pairwise non-adjacent vertices. An independent set of maximum size is a *maximum independent set* of G, and $\alpha(G)$ is the cardinality of a maximum independent set in G. Let $\Omega(G)$ stand for the set of all maximum independent sets of G, and $\text{core}(G) = \bigcap\{S : S \in \Omega(G)\}$ [17].

A *matching* in a graph G is a set $M \subseteq E(G)$ such that no two edges of M share a common vertex. A *maximum matching* is a matching of maximum cardinality. By $\mu(G)$ is denoted the size of a maximum matching. A matching is *perfect* if it saturates all the vertices of the graph.

G is a *König-Egerváry graph* provided $\alpha(G) + \mu(G) = |V(G)|$ [5, 30]. As a well-known example, every bipartite graph is a König-Egerváry graph [6, 13]. Several properties of König-Egerváry graphs are presented in [12, 15, 24, 25, 28].

Theorem 1. *[16] A connected bipartite graph G has a perfect matching if and only if core$(G) = \emptyset$.*

Theorem 1 may fail for non-bipartite König-Egerváry graphs; e.g., the graphs G_1 and G_2 from Figure 1 have $\text{core}(G_1) = \{a\}$, and $\text{core}(G_2) = \{u\}$.



Fig. 1. Both G_1 and G_2 are König-Egerváry graphs with perfect matchings.

In a König-Egerváry graph, maximum matchings have a special property, emphasized by the following statement.

Lemma 1. *[18] Every maximum matching M of a König-Egerváry graph G is contained in each $(S, V(G) - S)$ and $|M| = |V(G) - S|$, where $S \in \Omega(G)$.*

If for every two incident edges of a cycle C exactly one of them belongs to a matching M, then C is called an *M-alternating cycle* [14]. It is clear that an M-alternating cycle should be of even length. A matching M in G is called *alternating cycle-free* if G has no M-alternating cycle. For example, the matching $\{ab, cd, ef\}$ of the graph G from Figure 2 is alternating cycle-free.



Fig. 2. The unique cycle of H is alternating with respect to the matching $\{yv, tx\}$.

A matching

$$M = \{a_i b_i : a_i, b_i \in V(G), 1 \leq i \leq k\}$$

of graph G is called *a uniquely restricted matching* if M is the unique perfect matching of $G[\{a_i, b_i : 1 \leq i \leq k\}]$ [9]. For bipartite graphs, this notion was first introduced in [14], under the name *clean matching*. It appears also in the context of matrix theory, as a *constrained matching* [10].

Theorem 2. *[9] A matching is uniquely restricted if and only if it is alternating cycle-free.*

For instance, all the maximum matchings of the graph G in Figure 2 are uniquely restricted, while the graph H from the same figure has both uniquely restricted maximum matchings (e.g., $\{uv, xw\}$) and non-uniquely restricted maximum matchings (e.g., $\{xy, tv\}$).

Lemma 2. *[4] If a graph without isolated vertices has a unique maximum matching, then this matching is perfect.*

To find a maximum matching one needs $O(m \bullet \sqrt{n})$ time for a graph with n vertices and m edges [29]. If our goal is to check whether a graph possesses a unique perfect matching, then we can do better. A most efficient unique perfect matching algorithm runs in $O(m \bullet log^4 n)$ time [8]. An $O(m)$ algorithm is given for the special cases of chestnut and elementary soliton graphs in [2]. It is known that bipartite graphs with a unique maximum matching can be recognized by an $O(m)$ algorithm as well [4].

Conjecture 1. [1] For a graph of size m, a unique perfect matching, if it exists, can always be found in $O(m)$ time.

In what follows, we validate Conjecture 1 for both König-Egerváry graphs and unicyclic graphs.

2 Results

According to Theorem 2, if M is a perfect matching in graph G, then M is unique if and only if no cycle of G is alternating with respect to M. Therefore, a perfect matching in a tree, if any, must be unique.

Lemma 3. *[4, 19] If $G = (A, B, E)$ is a bipartite graph having a unique perfect matching, then $A \cap \text{leaf}(G) \neq \emptyset$ and $B \cap \text{leaf}(G) \neq \emptyset$.*

In other words, a bipartite graph with a unique perfect matching must have at least two leaves. Notice that there exist non-bipartite graphs with unique perfect matchings and without leaves. For an example, see the graph G_2 from Figure 3.



Fig. 3. Both G_1 and G_2 have perfect matchings.

The following lemma, firstly presented in [20], shows that every König-Egerváry graph with a unique perfect matching has at least one leaf (see, for example, the graph G_1, depicted in Figure 1). We give a proof here for the sake of self-containment.

Lemma 4. *[20] If G is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique perfect matching, then $S \cap \text{leaf}(G) \neq \emptyset$ holds for every $S \in \Omega(G)$.*

Proof. Let

$$M = \{a_i b_i : 1 \leq i \leq \mu(G)\}$$

be the unique perfect matching of G and $S \in \Omega(G)$. Since G is a König-Egerváry graph, it follows that

$$|M| = \mu(G) = \alpha(G) = |S|\,.$$

By Lemma 1, $M \subseteq (S, V(G) - S)$ and, therefore, we may assume that

$$S = \{a_i : 1 \leq i \leq \mu(G)\}.$$

Suppose that $S \cap \text{leaf}(G) = \emptyset$. Hence, $|N(a_i)| \geq 2$ for every $a_i \in S$. Under these conditions, we shall build an M-alternating cycle C. We begin with the edge a_1b_1; since $|N(a_1)| \geq 2$, there is some $b \in (V - S - \{b_1\}) \cap N(a_1)$, say b_2. We continue with $a_2b_2 \in M$. Further, $N(a_2)$ contains some $b \in (V - S - \{b_2\})$. If $b_1 \in N(a_2)$, we are done, because $G[\{a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2\}] = C_4$. Otherwise, we may suppose that $b = b_3$, and we add to the growing cycle the edge a_3b_3. Since G has a finite number of vertices, after a number of edges from M, we must find some edge a_kb_j having $1 \leq j < k$. So, the cycle C we found has

$$V(C) = \{a_i, b_i : j \leq i \leq k\},$$

$$E(C) = \{a_i b_i : j \leq i \leq k\} \cup \{a_i b_{i+1} : j \leq i < k\} \cup \{a_k b_j\}.$$

Clearly, C is an M-alternating cycle. Hence, by Theorem 2, M is not unique, which contradicts the hypothesis on M.

It is worth mentioning that Lemma 4 may fail for König-Egerváry graphs having more than one perfect matching; e.g., the graph G_1 from Figure 3.

Lemma 4 plays a key-role in the following procedure checking whether a König-Egerváry graph has a unique perfect matching. It reads as follows: as long as there a leaf w, add the edge connecting w with its only neighbor to a matching, and remove both vertices from the graph. If we end up with the empty graph, then we have found a unique perfect matching, and validated that our input is a König-Egerváry graph. Otherwise, either the graph is a non-König-Egerváry graph, or it has more than one maximum matching. Actually, this procedure is a variation of the Karp-Sipser algorithm [11].

Algorithm 1: Unique Perfect Matching

Input: A graph G;
Output: A unique perfect matching M of G, and an evidence that G is a König-Egerváry graph;
otherwise, a non-empty subgraph of G without leaves.

Initialize a one-dimensional boolean array $Vertex[\,]$ with $Vertex[i] = True$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. It will be updated further as the set of vertices $V(G)$ changes.
Find the set $\text{leaf}(G)$ and present it like a **Queue**.
$M \leftarrow \emptyset$
while $\text{leaf}(G) \neq \emptyset$ **do**
    Take the first vertex from $\text{leaf}(G)$, say v.
    if $v \in V(G)$ *(or, in other words,* ***if*** $Vertex[v] = True$*)* **then**
        $V(G) \leftarrow V(G) - N[v]$
        $M \leftarrow M \cup (v, N(v))$
        $\text{leaf}(G) \leftarrow \text{leaf}(G) - v$
        Add all new leaves of G from $N(N(v)) - v$ to $\text{leaf}(G)$.
if $V(G) = \emptyset$ **then**
    M is a unique perfect matching and G is a König-Egerváry graph.
else if *G is a König-Egerváry graph* **then**
    The number of maximum matchings is greater than 1.
    else
        Nothing specific can be said on the number of maximum matchings.



Fig. 4. Both G_1 and G_2 are König-Egerváry graph, but only G_1 has a unique perfect matching.

When Algorithm 1 is applied to the graphs from Figure 4, only for G_1 it ends with $V(G) = \emptyset$. On the other hand, G_3 has perfect matchings, but it is not a König-Egerváry graph.

Notice that there exist non-König-Egerváry graphs having a unique perfect matching, with or without leaves (for instance, the graphs G_2, G_3 in Figure 5).



Fig. 5. Each of the graphs G_1, G_2, G_3 has a unique perfect matching, but only G_1 is a König-Egerváry graph.

Theorem 3. *Algorithm 1 ends with $V(G) = \emptyset$ if and only if G is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique perfect matching.*

Proof. If part. Let

$$M = \{a_i b_i : 1 \leq i \leq \mu(G)\}$$

be the unique perfect matching of the König-Egerváry graph G, and $S \in \Omega(G)$. According to Lemma 1,

$$M \subseteq (S, V(G) - S),$$

and by Lemma 4, we may assume that

$$a_1 \in S \cap \text{leaf}(G).$$

Clearly,

$$G - \{a_1, b_1\} = G - N[a_1]$$

is still a König-Egerváry graph with the unique perfect matching, $M - \{a_1 b_1\}$. Lemma 4 assures that the graph $G - N[a_1]$ has one leaf (at least), say a_2, and

$$G - N[a_1] - N[a_2]$$

is again a König-Egerváry graph having a unique perfect matching, namely,

$$M - \{a_1 b_1, a_2 b_2\}.$$

Hence, repeating this procedure $\mu(G)$ times, we finally arrive at $G = \emptyset$, i.e., Algorithm 1 correctly finds the unique perfect matching of G.

Only if part. We proceed by induction on $m = |E(G)|$.

The result is true for $m = 1$.

Assume that the assertion holds for every graph on $m \geq 1$ edges, and let G be a graph on $m + 1$ edges, for which Algorithm 1 ends with $V(G) = \emptyset$.

If $a \in \text{leaf}(G)$ and $ab \in E(G)$ is the first pendant edge that Algorithm 1 deletes from G, then the remaining graph

$$G - ab = (V(G) - \{a, b\}, E(G) - \{ab\}) = (W, U)$$

has m edges and Algorithm 1 ends with $W = \emptyset$. Consequently, by the induction hypothesis, $G - ab$ is a König-Egerváry graph with a unique perfect matching, say M. Hence, there is no M-alternating cycle in $G - ab$.

Clearly, $M \cup \{ab\}$ is a perfect matching in G, and it is unique, because the vertex $a \in V(G)$ can be saturated only by the pendant edge ab, and there do not exist $M \cup \{ab\}$-alternating cycles in G. In addition, if S is a maximum independent set in $G - ab$, then $S \cup \{a\}$ is a maximum independent set in G, and thus

$$|V(G) - \{a, b\}| + 2 = \alpha(G - ab) + \mu(G - ab) + 2 =$$
$$= |S \cup \{a\}| + |M \cup \{ab\}| \leq \alpha(G) + \mu(G) \leq |V(G)|,$$

i.e., G is a König-Egerváry graph.

Corollary 1. *A König-Egerváry graph G has a unique perfect matching if and only if Algorithm 1 ends with $V(G) = \emptyset$.*

Graphs G_2 from Figure 5 and G_3 from Figure 4 show that Algorithm 1 can not estimate the number of maximum matchings of non-König-Egerváry graphs.

It is known that if a graph does not possess a perfect matching, then it has two maximum matchings at least. Consequently, by Corollary 1, if G is a König-Egerváry graph and Algorithm 1 returns $V \neq \emptyset$, then its number of maximum matchings is greater than 1.

Since every edge of the graph G is in use no more than twice in Algorithm 1, we obtain the following.

Theorem 4. *Given a König-Egerváry graph with m edges, Algorithm 1 decides whether it has a unique perfect matching in $O(m)$ time.*

Clearly, if the cycle of a unicyclic graph G is even, then G is bipartite, and hence it is a König-Egerváry graph.

Proposition 1. *If a unicyclic non-bipartite graph G has M as a perfect matching, then M is unique and G is a König-Egerváry graph.*

Proof. Let C be the unique cycle of G. Since C is an odd cycle, Theorem 2 ensures that M is unique.

Notice that in order to show that G is a König-Egerváry graph it is enough to prove that G has an independent set of size equal to $|M|$.

Let

$$M_C = \{uv \in M : \{u, v\} \cap V(C) \neq \emptyset\},$$

and H be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices saturated by M_C.

Since C is odd and M covers all the vertices of G, it follows that M_C is a (unique) perfect matching in H. In addition, H has one leaf at least, say a.

Removing the vertex a together with its neighbor may be considered as the first step of Algorithm 1. Clearly, $H - a$ is a forest with a perfect matching. Consequently, by Theorem 3 Algorithm 1 terminates with empty graph, which, in turn, means that H is a König-Egerváry graph.

Each connected component of the graph $G - H$ is a tree T with a perfect matching. Consequently, if $uv \in E$ is such that $u \in V(H)$ and $v \in V(T)$, then, by Theorem 1, claiming in our case that $\text{core}(T) = \emptyset$, there must be a maximum independent set S_T in T with $v \notin S_T$. If Γ denotes the family of all connected components of the graph $G - H$, we obtain that

$$A = S_H \cup \left(\bigcup \{S_T : T \in \Gamma\} \right)$$

is an independent set of G, and $|A| = |M|$. Therefore, G is a König-Egerváry graph.

Corollary 2. *If G is unicyclic and has m edges, then Algorithm 1 decides whether it has a unique perfect matching in $O(m)$ time.*

3 Conclusions

In this paper we have validated Conjecture 1 claiming that a unique perfect matching, if it exists, can always be found in $O(m)$ time, for both König-Egerváry graphs and unicyclic graphs.

Very well-covered graphs, a subclass of König-Egerváry graphs with perfect matchings, can be recognized in polynomial time. Namely, to recognize a graph as being very well-covered, we just need to show that it has a perfect matching M such that for every edge $xy \in M$: $N(x) \cap N(y) = \emptyset$, and each $v \in N(x) - \{y\}$ is adjacent to all vertices of $N(y) - \{x\}$ [7]. To check this property one has to handle $O\left(n^3\right)$ pairs of vertices in the worst case. Recently, very well-covered graphs with unique perfect matching proved their importance in [21, 22]. It is an open problem to recognize a very well-covered graph with a unique perfect matching, faster than in $O\left(n^3\right)$ time, when the input is a general graph.

References

1. M. Bartha, *Efficient unique perfect matching algorithms*, 8^{th} Joint Conference on Mathematics and Computer Science, 2010, Komárno, Slovakia.
2. M. Bartha, M. Krész, *Deciding the deterministic property for soliton graphs*, Ars Mathematica Contemporanea **2** (2009) 121-136.
3. F. Belardo, M. Li, M. Enzo, S. K. Simić, J.Wang, *On the spectral radius of unicyclic graphs with prescribed degree sequence*, Linear Algebra Appl. 432 (2010) 2323-2334.
4. K. Cechlárová, *The uniquely solvable bipartite matching problem*, Operation Research Letters **10** (1991) 221-224.
5. R. W. Deming, *Independence numbers of graphs - an extension of the König-Egerváry theorem*, Discrete Mathematics **27** (1979) 23-33.
6. E. Egervary, *On combinatorial properties of matrices*, Mat. Lapok **38** (1931) 16-28.

7. O. Favaron, *Very well-covered graphs*, Discrete Mathematics **42** (1982) 177-187.
8. H. N. Gabow, H. Kaplan, R. E. Tarjan, *Unique maximum matching algorithms*, Journal of Algorithms 40 (2001) 159-183.
9. M. C. Golumbic, T. Hirst, M. Lewenstein, *Uniquely restricted matchings*, Algorithmica **31** (2001) 139-154.
10. D. Hershkowitz, H. Schneider, *Ranks of zero patterns and sign patterns*, Linear and Multilinear Algebra **34** (1993) 3-19.
11. R. M. Karp, M. Sipser, *Maximum matchings in sparse random graphs*, in: Proceedings of 22^{nd} Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (1981) 364-375.
12. E. Korach, T. Nguyen, B. Peis, *Subgraph characterization of red/blue-split graphs and König-Egerváry graphs*, Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, ACM Press, 2006, pp. 842850.
13. D. König, *Graphen und Matrizen*, Mat. Lapok **38** (1931) 116-119.
14. S. Krogdahl, *The dependence graph for bases in matroids*, Discrete Mathematics **19** (1977) 47-59.
15. C. E. Larson, *The critical independence number and an independence decomposition*, European Journal of Combinatorics **32** (2011) 294300.
16. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On the structure of α-stable graphs*, Discrete Mathematics **236** (2001) 227-243.
17. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Combinatorial properties of the family of maximum stable sets of a graph*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **117** (2002) 149-161.
18. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On α^+-stable König-Egerváry graphs*, Discrete Mathematics **263** (2003) 179-190.
19. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Local maximum stable sets in bipartite graphs with uniquely restricted maximum matchings*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **132** (2004) 163-174.
20. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Triangle-free graphs with uniquely restricted maximum matchings and their corresponding greedoids*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **155** (2007) 2414-2425.
21. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Very well-covered graphs of girth at least four and local maximum stable set greedoids*, Discrete Mathematics, Algorithms and Applications **3** (2011) 245-252.
22. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Local maximum stable set greedoids stemming from very well-covered graphs*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **160** (2012) 1864-1871.
23. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On the core of a unicyclic graph*, Ars Mathematica Contemporanea **5** (2012) 321-327.
24. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *Critical independent sets and König-Egerváry graphs*, Graphs and Combinatorics **28** (2012) 243-250.
25. V.E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On maximum matchings in König-Egerváry graphs*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **161** (2013) 1635-1638.
26. V. E. Levit, E. Mandrescu, *On the intersection of all critical sets of a unicyclic graph*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **162** (2014) 409-414
27. J. Li, J. Guo, W. C. Shiu, *The smallest values of algebraic connectivity for unicyclic graphs*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **158** (2010) 1633-1643.
28. L. Lovász, *Ear decomposition of matching covered graphs*, Combinatorica **3** (1983) 105-117.
29. S. Micali, V. V. Vazirani, *An $O(|V|^{\frac{1}{2}} \bullet |E|)$ algorithm for finding maximum matching in general graphs*, Proceedings of the 21^{st} IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (1980) 17-27.

30. F. Sterboul, *A characterization of the graphs in which the transversal number equals the matching number*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory Series B **27** (1979) 228-229.
31. Y. Wu, J. Shu, *The spread of the unicyclic graphs*, European Journal of Combinatorics **31** (2010) 411-418.
32. M. Zhai, R. Liu, J. Shu, *Minimizing the least eigenvalue of unicyclic graphs with fixed diameter*, Discrete Mathematics **310** (2010) 947-955.